

PATENT  
P56945**REMARKS**

This Amendment is prepared in response to the Office action mailed on 19 November 2007 (Paper No. 20071101).

Claims 18-20, 23, and 24 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 for the reasons stated in section 2 on page 2 of the Office Action.

By this Amendment, paragraph [0121] has been revised so as to overcome this rejection.

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Suda in view of Ihara for the reasons stated in section 4 on pages 3-5 of the Office Action. Claims 1-4, 10-15, and 18-24 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Suda in view of Lu and further in view of Ihara for the reasons stated in section 5 on pages 5-17 of the Office Action. Lastly, claims 5-7 and 16-17 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Suda in view of Lu and Ihara and Nelakanti for the reasons stated in section 6 on pages 17 and 18 of the Office Action.

These rejections are traversed for the following reasons:

With regard to the rejections of claims 8 and 9, the Examiner alleges that Suda teaches all of the recited limitations except for specifically disclosing a second access node receiving a second network service and a second private access network transceiver system setting up a session when the second access node moves within the wireless service area of the second private access network transceiver.

PATENT  
P56945

The Examiner then alleges that Ihara teaches the features admittedly deficient in Suda and then argues that it would be obvious to combine the features of Suda and Ihara to produce a combination purportedly meeting the recited limitations of the rejected claims.

The Examiner reasoning is that the combination " provides a technique of allowing a radio terminal that can be used both in a private branch exchange network and a public exchange network to terminate a call."

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's argument and reasoning in that the Examiner has merely stated that it would be obvious to combine the features of the two references to produce a combination purportedly meeting the recited limitations of the rejected claims. The Examiner has not stated any reason for combining references other than for producing the combination purportedly meeting the recited limitations of the rejected claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 8 and 9 are patentable over Suda in view of Ihara.

In the remaining rejections, the Examiner essentially repeats three arguments. Namely:

- (1) Suda fails to teach carrying out a call connection release between the access nodes.
- (2) Lu teaches carrying out a call connection release between the access nodes and it would be obvious to combine the features of Suda and Lu.
- (3) Suda and Lu fail to teach high-speed wireless operation. However, Ihara teaches

PATENT  
P56945

high-speed wireless operation and it would be obvious to combine the features of Suda and Lu and Ihara.

In citing Ihara, the Examiner argues that the abstract of Ihara teaches high-speed wireless operation.

Applicants disagree in that the abstract of Ihara merely teaches a plurality of public branch exchanges connected together by high-speed data lines, that is, leased digital land lines (see lines 24-37 of column 5 of Ihara).

Thus, Ihara does not teach or suggest high-speed wireless operation.

Furthermore, it would not be obvious to combine the features of Suda and Lu in the fashion noted by the Examiner since there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference supporting the proposed combination. Rather, the two references were combined solely for the purpose of producing a combination purportedly meeting the recited limitations of the rejected claims.

Still furthermore, as previously noted above, it would not be obvious to combine the features of Suda and Ihara.

Lastly, Nelakanti was cited by the Examiner merely as teaching the data location register been configured to be based on an Internet Protocol. The Examiner then alleges that it would be

PATENT  
P56945

obvious to combine the features of Nelakanti and Suda and Lu and Ihara to "permit users to operate freely in both public and private wireless networks using standard mobile stations while achieving high private network data rates."

As with the other rejections, it is submitted that it would not be obvious to combine the features of the four cited references in the fashion noted by the Examiner nor would the Examiner's reasoning be apparent to those skilled in the art but rather the Examiner's reasoning uses hindsight based on the teachings of the present specification to produce a combination which purportedly meets the recited limitations of the rejected claims.

The present invention teaches updating state information of respective access nodes (ANs) according to a call connection and a call connection release between the ANs which performs data communication in a high-speed wireless data system through a private network, and providing the updated state information to the public network according to the requirement, so that the private network and the public network can share the state information of ANs connected to the private network and the DLR of the private network.

On the other hand, Suda (US6,122,518) aims to manage state information of each channel assignable in a base station, and not to manage state information of each mobile station which performs a communication. Thus, Suda cannot provide information on the state of each mobile station using the state information of the channel.

PATENT  
P56945


Furthermore, Suda and Ihara fail to teach the recited feature of the present invention, namely, the private network and the public network can share the state information of ANs connected to the private network and the DLR of the private network;

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present claims are patentable over the cited art and should therefore now be in a condition suitable for allowance.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Robert E. Bushnell,  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56945  
Date: 2/19/08  
I.D.: REB/HZ